

NEWS

Indianapolis, Indiana  
February 2, 1960

**TOBACCO CO.  
BOOSTS FUND  
FOR RESEARCH**

New York, Feb. 26 — Research grants made by the tobacco industry research committee have grown to a total of \$3,700,000, Timothy V. Hartnett, chairman of the committee, announced here.

He said the grants had gone to 90 scientists in 61 institutions in the United States.

The 1959 report of Dr. Clarence Cook Little, scientific director of the committee, contained digests of 38 research papers published during the year by persons who had received committee grants.

NEWS

Chicago, Illinois  
February 17, 1960

**AFTER 91 STUDIES**

**Cigaret Makers' Views on Cancer**

This is the tobacco industry's side of it:

After sponsoring 91 research studies in six years, the Tobacco Industry Research Committee (TIRC) says it is unable to accept the American Cancer Society's conclusions that cigarette smoking is directly responsible for lung cancer or aggravates heart disease.

Dr. Clarence Cook Little, scientific director, said in a report released Wednesday that the findings now make it clear that "the problems in cancer and cardiovascular diseases are tremendously complicated and the chance of finding a simple answer is small or nonexistent."

The research committee was formed in 1954 to support studies of independent scientists into tobacco use and human health after the first reports associating cigarettes and lung cancer were released.

DR. LITTLE cites these unanswered questions.

Are the tensions and inner stresses that make people smoke a basic cause rather than the cigarettes themselves? Accumulating evidence suggests that smoking patterns of an individual may often be a reflection of traits rather than

TRIBUNE

Chicago, Illinois  
February 27, 1960

a determiner of them, says Dr. Little.

What about the role of heredity? People may differ in response to cigarettes because of their innate characteristics.

How about air pollutants, irradiation, humidity, temperature and other factors in the environment?

How much do bacteria or viruses influence cell or tissue changes?

How about fats and other foods, or drugs such as hormones?

"Both intelligent laymen and scientists will not accept a simple cause and effect relationship in cancer and cardiovascular disease unless such a relationship can be proved by something more than disputed statistics, transferred interpretation from animal work, or limited autopsy findings," said Dr. Little.

**Opinions of Others**

**Cigarettes Called Cancer 'Fall Guy'**

We reprint periodically on this page editorials from other newspapers and magazines which we think might interest our readers. The News does not necessarily agree or disagree with the opinions expressed.

From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent

Before Salk vaccine broke upon the scene there was a great scrambling around in "authoritative" and other circles concerning the cause of polio.

Even yet, it is not known what causes polio to strike one person, pass up another, and strike still a third. Many, and in some instances bizarre, have been the explanations.

Much the same scare tactics are being used in regard to lung cancer. Just now tobacco is bearing the brunt of the alleged "guilt," although the case against it is far from proven.

The Tobacco Institute, Inc., has moved to counteract a recent U.S. Public Health Service report that claimed "the weight of evidence, at present, implicates smoking as the principal etiological (causative) factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer."

This is just another in a long series of "expert" views which, much in the manner of a prosecuting attorney, have set out to convict tobacco with no regard to the total weight of evidence.

In his comment on the Public Health Service review, Dr. Clarence Cook Little, cancer research scientist who is scientific director of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, said many recent scientific reports on smoking and lung cancer were either omitted or glossed over.

He pointed out that the report "clearly states that experimental evidence does not support the theories."

The review recognizes that lung cancer afflicts non-smokers, and therefore can't all be blamed on smoking. It concedes the still-to-be evaluated role of air pollutants and occupational exposures. It admits differences in lung cancer incidence rates that can-

not be explained by the smoking theory."

Dr. Little, citing a number of scientific papers, pointed to evidence that he said:

1 Finds that people described as the world's heaviest cigarette smokers have low lung cancer death rates compared with people who smoke less but have been long exposed to urban air pollution.

2 Shows that direct inhalation of tobacco smoke by laboratory animals over long periods of time has not resulted in causing lung cancer in these animals.

3 Reveals that human lung tissues undergo changes, considered suspicious by some, that are found among both young and old, non-smokers and smokers, while lung tissues 'may be perfectly normal in heavy smokers.'

4 Confirms the long-established but little-publicized fact that lung cancer occurs more frequently in people who have a medical history of previous serious lung ailments, such as tuberculosis, pneumonia and influenza, indicating a relationship of possible significance.

Indications are that tobacco is being used by many "experts" as the whipping boy simply because they have not yet nailed down the precise cause, if any, of lung cancer or, for that matter, cancer incidence in other internal parts of the body.

There seems to be a tendency to glass over other possible causes, such as fumes from auto exhausts, industrial plant fumes, and the generally greater increase in air pollution that has accompanied industrialization.

The point is that the case against tobacco is far from proven. Until it is, the U.S. Public Health Service and other authorities should cease risk losing public confidence by going off half-cocked.